

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed 3/6/2006, Claims 1 – 14 and 16 were indicated as being allowable if certain §112 objections were overcome. Claim 15 was rejected as being anticipated by the prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claim 16 was further objected to for depending upon a rejected base claim, but was otherwise indicated as being allowable.

In response, Applicant has made amendment to the specification to correct informalities pointed out by the Examiner. Claims 8 and 15 has further been amended to clarify the distinctions between them and the prior art, and Claim 16 was rejected. Applicant respectfully asserts that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

As for the §112 rejection related to an explanation of the point of view as seen in Figure 6, Applicant submits the following:

“Figure 6 depicts the DF set at two subsequent locations. For the purpose of clarifying the geometry of the locating solution method, however, the DF set is shown as stationary (relative to the transmitter location graphical solution). As a result, Figure 6 can be considered to be a DF Set-centric view, wherein the DF set appears to be stationary and any lines of bearing or transmitter locations are in relation (or relative to) the moving DF set. In fact, the transmitter might actually be stationary in the depicted Figure 6, with all relative movement being provided by the transmitter. First, PP(0) (the cross-over point) is determined as discussed in the Specification previously. As the DF Set is then moved, the line of bearing to the cross-over point will continue to “point” towards PP(0). When a new DF Set location is reached and a new line of bearing is “drawn” to the newly-detected transmission. The connecting vector, in this example, is then drawn perpendicular to the

latest line of bearing, through the last line of bearing or estimate position (in this case it is PP(0)).”

If the Examiner is so inclined, the Applicant would appreciate an Examiner's amendment adding the preceding language contained in quotations into the Specification, Page 12, as a new paragraph commencing at Line 18 (i.e. inserted as a separate paragraph before the paragraph commencing with “Three things . . .”).

Regarding Paragraph 5, objection #2, the undersigned was unable to locate the objectionable language indicated; assistance is required.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINS & ASSOCIATES



Karl M. Steins
Registration No. 40,186
2333 Camino del Rio South
Suite 120
San Diego, California 92108
Telephone: (619) 692-2004
Facsimile: (619) 692-2003